

CHAPTER THREE

COMMUNITY ISSUES AND PRIORITIES

INTRODUCTION

During preparation of the County Land Use Plan, the Carbon County Planning Commission and its consultant, Pedersen Planning Consultants, attempted to gain a sense of community attitudes, concerns, direction, and preferences regarding land use, the economy, small business activities, natural resources, the environment and other issues that are relevant to local residents of Carbon County. This task was undertaken with the view that the Land Use Plan should be guided, in part, by the perceived will of the people who live in Carbon County.

In order to gain the insights of County residents, the Carbon County Department of Planning and Development held two rounds of public hearings at several locations throughout Carbon County. A second approach was the preparation and distribution of community attitude surveys for residents, ranches, and small business owners. The cumulative information gained from public meetings and the three surveys provided extremely useful insights to the Department of Planning and Development, the County Planning Commission and the County Board of Commissioners.

The methodologies that were used to obtain community input via both approaches are described in the following paragraphs. Public comments obtained from public meetings and the three surveys are summarized in Chapter Two of the Land Use Plan and incorporated within the evaluation of the several, general land use topics that comprise the overall Land Use Plan. Copies of the resident, ranch, and small business owner surveys are presented in Appendix A.

The cumulative information gained from public meetings and the three surveys provided useful insights for the Department of Planning and Development, the County Planning Commission and the County Board of Commissioners. For the purposes of the Land Use Plan, the information is presented under several topical areas to facilitate public review. The aggregation of this information in this manner also enabled the Department of Planning and Development to refer to residents' concerns during its preparation and development of various parts of the Land Use Plan.

RESIDENT SURVEY

Methodology

Pedersen Planning Consultants prepared the resident survey form. The survey was intended to help the County Planning Commission, the Board of County Commissioners, and the consultant gain a better understanding of various land use issues that confront Carbon County.

A resident survey was distributed to all attendees of public hearings that were held in March and August 1996. Surveys were distributed to meeting attendees, who were residents of Carbon County, as they arrived at one of several public meeting locations. Additional surveys were passed out and collected during the course of the meeting prior to any discussion of issues by local residents.

Resident surveys were also completed by residents, who attended the County Fair in Rawlins, Wyoming in August 1996. Persons who approached a booth sponsored by the County Department of Planning and Development were asked if they had previously completed a resident survey to avoid any redundancy in resident views and concerns. Residents were encouraged to complete the surveys and were advised that they might win a free \$25 gift certificate from Bubba's Bar-B-Q in Saratoga.

The Rawlins Daily Times also published a few newspaper articles that encouraged Carbon County residents to complete resident surveys. In response to some telephone requests, several additional resident surveys were mailed to a small number of completed by residents who later returned completed surveys to the Carbon County Department of Planning and Development office in Rawlins.

Survey results were tabulated to facilitate a review of written responses. Subsequently, survey results were summarized in statistical tables to facilitate the efficient evaluation and presentation of survey results. Survey results were segregated for residents who lived within or adjacent to eleven residential communities in Carbon County.

Characteristics of Survey Respondents

Sample Size

Some 303 residents completed resident surveys for the Carbon County Land Use Plan. Respondents to the survey were 15 years of age and older.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census estimated that the total 1990 resident population of Carbon County was approximately 16,659 persons. The segment of the total County population, which was 15 years and older, represented about 12,476 persons, or about 75 percent of the total 1990 population.

The receipt of 303 completed surveys provided a statistical reliability of roughly 95 percent (Taylor, 1997). Consequently, the sample size is believed to be a statistically valid sample that provides pertinent information for the Land Use Plan.

Place of Residence in Carbon County

Roughly 47 percent of the persons surveyed are residents of the City of Rawlins or nearby unincorporated areas of Carbon County. About 18 percent of those surveyed were from Saratoga and nearby unincorporated areas; approximately 10 percent were from Baggs. The remaining 25 percent of the sample group included considerably smaller numbers of residents that reside within and nearby Encampment, Riverside, Sinclair, Medicine Bow, Elk Mountain, Hanna, and Walcott. When correlated with the distribution of the 1990 population, it is evident that the residential location of respondents is generally representative of overall geographical distribution of the Carbon County's resident population.

Age of Respondents and Length of Residence

Respondents to the survey included persons ranging between 15 years of age and older. The age of survey respondents was generally comparable to the 1990 age characteristics of the Carbon County population (Tables 3-1 and 3-2). However, some differences were apparent. For example, survey respondents between 15 and 19 years of age (13 percent) were slightly greater than the 1990 population distribution for this age group (9 percent). In contrast, survey respondents in the 25-29 age group (4 percent) were considerably less than the 1990 population distribution for the same age group (11 percent).

The average length of residency in Carbon County for all survey respondents was approximately 23 years. Respondents who had a greater length of residency resided in the vicinity of Medicine Bow (38 years). Respondents from Hanna had the least time of residence within the County (7 years). Overall, the experience of respondents indicated that most residents probably have a strong familiarity with local environmental conditions, resources, the regional economy, land uses, and other issues included in the survey.

**TABLE 3-1
RESIDENT SURVEY
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS**

Respondent Location	Which of the 10 municipalities do you live within?	Which of the 10 municipalities do you live outside of?	How long have you lived in Carbon County? <i>Avg No. of Years</i>	What is your age?											
				15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70 +
Baggs	22	9	19.5	14			2	6	4	1	1	1	1	1	
Dixon	1	5	32.0	1			1	1	1				1		1
Elk Mountain	8		22.6			1	1	1					1		1
Encampment	11	5	27.6	1		1	1	1	1		2	3	4		2
Hanna	10		6.9			1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2		2
Medicine Bow	11		38.0					1		1	1		2	3	3
Rawlins	138	4	23.7	16	8	5	15	16	17	12	14	14	5	10	11
Riverside	3	10	24.0					1	3	2		3	1		3
Saratoga	36	18	23.6	4	2	2	2	11	7	7	6	5	3	3	2
Sinclair	4	2	22.3	1				1	1	1				1	1
Walcott		1	18.0								1				
No response	2	3	17.7	2		1									
TOTAL RESPONSES	246	57	County Average 23.2 years	39	10	11	24	40	35	25	27	28	20	18	26

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-2 COMPARATIVE AGE DISTRIBUTION RESIDENT SURVEY RESPONDENTS AND 1990 POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS				
Age Group (Years of Age)	1990 Population (Persons)	Proportion of 1990 Population (Percent)	Relative Proportion to 15+ Year Population (Percent)	Age Distribution of Survey Respondents (Percent)
1-14	4,183	25	0	0
15-19	1,174	07	09	13
20-24	831	05	07	03
25-29	1,364	08	11	04
30-34	1,521	09	12	08
35-39	1,442	09	12	13
40-44	1,274	08	11	12
45-49	982	06	08	08
50-54	861	05	07	09
55-59	680	04	05	09
60-64	644	04	05	07
65-69	595	03	04	06
70+	1,108	07	09	08
Total	16,659	100	100	100

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1997; Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

Reasons Why Respondents Originally Came to Carbon County

Almost 40 percent of the survey respondents came to Carbon County because of employment (Table 3-3). About 29 percent of those responding to the survey were born and/or raised in Carbon County. Family, relatives, or friends brought about 20 percent of the survey respondents to the County. Those remaining were motivated to relocate to Carbon County because of the County's rural lifestyle or other characteristics.

What Motivates Respondents to Remain in Carbon County

Rural lifestyle, family, relatives and friends, as well as employment and business opportunities, motivate roughly 75 percent of the survey respondents to remain in Carbon County (Table 3-3). The remaining 25 percent are motivated by one or more of the communities in Carbon County, or other considerations.

Expected Length of Residency in Carbon County

Respondents to the survey also appear to have a long-term commitment to Carbon County. Roughly 53 percent of those surveyed indicated that they planned to remain in the County for the rest of their life if they were able to financially sustain themselves and their families (Table 3-4). Another eight percent anticipate residing in the County for the next 16 to 30 years.

In contrast, less than five percent envisioned leaving Carbon County in less than one year. However, about 15 percent of the survey respondents apparently plan to relocate within one to five years.

TABLE 3-3
RESIDENT SURVEY
MOTIVATION FOR RESIDENCY IN CARBON COUNTY

Respondent	What brought you to Carbon County?						In order of importance, indicate what motivates you to remain in Carbon County?				
Location	born and/or raised here	employment	family, relatives, friends	rural lifestyle	other	no response	family, relatives, friends	employment/business	rural lifestyle	the community	other
	**Numbers provided below are weighted responses										
Baggs	12	12	7	3			256	232	234	215	28
Dixon	4	2	2	1			37	24	28	32	
Elk Mountain	2	3	3				41	35	57	33	
Encampment	6	5	7	5	1		122	100	131	119	22
Hanna		8	1		1		64	60	62	51	10
Medicine Bow	3	6	1	1		2	45	54	52	71	10
Rawlins	55	56	36	9	3	2	927	886	829	693	134
Riverside	1	7		3	1	1	51	81	102	79	10
Saratoga	12	29	10	8	1	1	302	365	387	320	48
Sinclair	1	3	1	1			154	159	167	167	29
Walcott	1	1						10	9		
No Location	2		1				30	6	9	8	7
Total	99	132	69	31	7	6	2029	2012	2067	1788	298
Percent	28.8%	38.4%	20.1%	9.0%	2.0%	1.7%	24.8%	24.6%	25.2%	21.8%	3.6%

*Note: More than one response was frequently given for the question, "What motivates you to remain in Carbon County?" For this reason, responses were statistically weighted to gain a more accurate insight to survey responses.

**TABLE 3-4
RESIDENT SURVEY
EXPECTED LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN CARBON COUNTY**

Respondent Location	If you generally remain healthy and are able to financially sustain yourself and/or your family, how long do you expect to remain in CC?									
	less than 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21-25 years	26-30 years	rest of my life	other	no response
Baggs	2	6						16	7	
Dixon			1					4	1	
Elk Mountain		2			1		1	1	3	
Encampment						1		12	2	1
Hanna	2	2			1			5		
Medicine Bow					1			8	2	
Rawlins	6	30	17	1	5	1	6	63	11	4
Riverside			2					9	1	1
Saratoga	3	3	3	2	3	1		36	2	1
Sinclair			1		1			4	1	
Walcott										
No Location	1	1						1		
Total Responses	14	44	24	3	12	3	7	159	30	7
Percent	4.6%	14.5%	7.9%	1.0%	4.0%	1.0%	2.3%	52.5%	9.9%	2.3%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

General Land Use Issues and Priorities

Survey results suggest that the number one land use priority of County residents is to conserve water resources (Table 3-5). Associated with water conservation was a related concern for the future availability of water to support future land uses.

Considerable priority was expressed concerning the governmental regulation of land uses. This concern appears to be directed primarily toward federal agencies since responses to another unrelated question contained in the survey indicate that residents would prefer the County Planning Commission to enforce future land uses and zoning more strictly.

The future economic viability of existing economic industries in Carbon County, e.g., mining, timber, oil and gas, ranching, and transportation, was also an important concern of Carbon County residents. The higher priority given for this issue was not surprising since many election polls before the 1996 U.S. Presidential election indicated that economic issues were a primary concern of most Americans.

A fourth priority identified by survey respondents was the need to conserve wildlife habitat in the County. The proximity and accessibility to these resources are believed to be primary factors that underlie resident concern for these resources.

Somewhat less priority was assigned for potential land speculation and the number of people that were moving into the County. In essence, both of the issues should be viewed in combination since the perception that “too many people are moving in” is typically one of the initial community reactions to increased land speculation in rural communities.

In general, the response by Carbon County residents suggest a need to balance the conservation of natural resources and the economic viability of resource-based industries in the County.

Water Resource Development Options for the Little Snake River Area

A water resource development project in the Little Snake River Area was authorized by the Wyoming State Legislature in 1993. Subsequently, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was requested by the State of Wyoming to initiate the preparation of a 404 permit for the project at a proposed Sandstone Reservoir site.

After its initial review of the proposed Sandstone project and various other project alternatives, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District concluded that the Sandstone project could not be permitted. This decision generated considerable dismay among some ranchers and residents from the Little Snake River area. This community reaction, combined with conflicting concerns by other Little Snake River residents, prompted the inclusion of a survey question relating to this project (Table 3-6). Responses to this question indicate that most residents of the County have no preference for the location of the project (40 percent), or they prefer the location of the project at the proposed Sandstone site (34 percent).

Roughly ten percent of the respondents indicated that they preferred the development of no water development project in the Little Snake River area. The proposed Dutch Joe site, which was previously identified as the recommended site by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Wyoming Water Development Commission, was viewed as the preferred development option for slightly less than five percent of the respondents.

**TABLE 3-5
RESIDENT SURVEY
LAND USE ISSUES AND PRIORITIES**

Respondent Location	How important are the following land issues to you? (Write "1" for most important, 2,3, 4, and so on.)							
	too many people moving in	potential land speculation/risi ng land values	need to conserve wildlife habitat	need to conserve water resources	availability of water to support future land uses	too much government regulation of land uses	economic viability of ranching, timber, oil/gas	other
* Numbers below are weighted responses								
Baggs	152	166	138	205	203	221	220	13
Dixon	8	28	14	25	11	19	22	8
Elk Mountain	56	52	58	61	55	52	58	
Encampment	86	105	84	109	101	116	114	
Hanna	22	62	43	44	56	51	65	
Medicine Bow	25	33	62	70	43	42	41	
Rawlins	459	596	793	777	769	722	671	33
Riverside	87	81	62	69	84	85	98	
Saratoga	267	314	283	313	276	333	308	22
Sinclair	33	37	51	48	41	41	35	
Walcott	10	9	8					
No Location	14	15	14	14	16	21	14	
Total of Weighted Responses	1219	1498	1610	1735	1655	1703	1646	76
Percent	10.9%	13.4%	14.4%	15.6%	14.9%	15.3%	14.8%	0.7%

*Note:

More than one response was frequently given for this question. For this reason, responses were statistically weighted to gain a more accurate insight to survey responses.

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-6
RESIDENT SURVEY
WATER DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS FOR LITTLE SNAKE RIVER

Respondent Location	Which of the following water resource development options for the Little Snake River area would you prefer?					
	Sandstone	Dutch Joe	no new project	no preference	no response	other
Baggs	19		3	7	1	1
Dixon	3		1	1	1	
Elk Mountain	2		1	3	2	
Encampment	4			7	5	
Hanna	3		1	5	1	
Medicine Bow	4		1	4	2	
Rawlins	46	8	12	66	11	1
Riverside	3			7	3	
Saratoga	16	5	9	17	6	1
Sinclair	2			4		
Walcott				1		
No Location	1	1	1			
TOTALS	103	14	29	122	32	3
Percent	34.0%	4.6%	9.6%	40.3%	10.5%	1.0%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

The Balance Between Resource Conservation and Resource Development

It is believed that most persons in Carbon County understand and would agree that the conservation, use, or development of natural resources requires a delicate balance. However, the status of that desired balance to County residents is less clear. Several questions in the resident survey attempted to better understand residents' perspectives concerning whether existing resource-based industries are desirable, as well as determine the desired direction for future resource use and resource conservation activities.

Ranching

The majority of respondents (46 percent) believe that cattle ranching and sheep production help conserve natural resources (Table 3-7). Only six percent expressed that these agricultural activities typically generate adverse environmental impacts. At the same time, 22 percent of the respondents suggested that cattle ranching and sheep production are a "dual-edged sword" because these activities both help conserve natural resources and generate adverse environmental consequences. In addition, a significant number of respondents (23 percent) expressed that they were unsure about whether or not ranching and sheep production helped or adversely impacted water, land and wildlife resources.

In general, these results suggest that cattle ranching and sheep production hold significant environmental value to the Carbon County community. Results of the survey indicate that this perspective is generally consistent throughout all communities within the County. Despite some concern for some environmental impacts associated with ranching and sheep production, it is believed that Carbon County residents are particularly aware of the significant amount of open space that is maintained through the continued operation of ranches in Carbon County.

Timber Resources

Approximately 47 percent of the survey respondents believe that increased governmental efforts should be directed toward conserving timber, wildlife, and water resources in the Medicine Bow National Forest (Table 3-8). The MBNF contains most of the available timber that is suitable for commercial harvesting.

About 42 percent believe that more efforts should be made to harvest more timber in the Medicine Bow National Forest to produce more commercial wood products in Carbon County. The remaining respondents made no response.

In contrast to other ongoing resource-based activities in the County economy, it is clear that survey respondents desire both increased resource conservation and increased timber harvests. However, survey responses also suggest that there is some geographical diversity in opinion that is based upon the dependence of the forest for employment.

Survey results suggest that the primary desire for increased conservation of timber resources is primarily from persons who reside in the vicinity of Rawlins, Medicine Bow, Elk Mountain, and Sinclair. This community attitude is believed to stem from the fact that the Medicine Bow National Forest is an important recreational destination for Rawlins and other Carbon County communities. Increased timber activities may be viewed by Rawlins, Medicine Bow, Elk Mountain, and Sinclair area residents as a potential threat to the use of various recreational areas and their participation in related recreational activities.

An opposite view was expressed by residents of Encampment, Riverside, Saratoga, Dixon, Hanna, and Baggs. These residents desire a greater level of timber harvests. Such a response reflects an apparent concern for employment and household income that is directly derived from timber harvests and the commercial processing of lumber products. It is interesting to note that four of these communities are immediately adjacent to the Medicine Bow National Forest.

TABLE 3-7
RESIDENT SURVEY
PERCEIVED IMPACT OF CATTLE RANCHING AND SHEEP PRODUCTION

Respondent Location	Do cattle ranching and sheep production activities in Carbon County ...				
	typically generate adverse impacts to our land and water resources?	help conserve land and water resources, as well as wildlife habitat?	both	not sure	no response
Baggs	1	15	6	9	
Dixon		3	2	1	
Elk Mountain	1	2	3	2	
Encampment		13	1	2	
Hanna	2	2	3	2	1
Medicine Bow	1	4	3	3	
Rawlins	9	60	30	39	7
Riverside		9	3		1
Saratoga	3	27	13	9	2
Sinclair	1	2	1	2	
Walcott		1			
No Location		1	1	1	
Total Responses	18	139	66	70	11
Percent	5.9%	45.7%	21.7%	23.0%	3.6%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-8
RESIDENT SURVEY
BALANCE BETWEEN TIMBER HARVESTING AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

Respondent Location	Which should be more important to Carbon County?			
	harvest more timber in the Medicine Bow Nat'l Forest to produce more commercial wood products	increase governmental efforts to conserve timber, wildlife, and water resources in MBNF	no response	other
Baggs	17	13	2	
Dixon	5	1		
Elk Mountain	2	6		
Encampment	13	3	1	
Hanna	7	3		
Medicine Bow	3	6	2	
Rawlins	48	91	16	
Riverside	9	2	1	1
Saratoga	27	18	10	
Sinclair	1	4	1	
Walcott		1		
No location	1	2		
Total Responses	133	150	33	1
Percent	42.0%	47.3%	10.4%	0.3%

Note: Some respondents indicated more than one response to this question

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

Oil and Gas Resources

Resident survey results suggest that conservation of water, land, and wildlife resources is of greater importance to Carbon County than increased oil and gas production (Table 3-9). This view is held primarily by residents of Rawlins, the county seat of Carbon County, and the Town of Saratoga.

Residents of Baggs and Medicine Bow expressed a greater desire for increased oil and gas production. This view of the balance between increased conservation and production is not surprising since these communities are considerably more dependent upon future oil and gas employment.

Recreation

The survey asked residents to identify the types of outdoor recreational opportunities that are important to local residents and to rank the importance of each activity (Table 3-10). Survey questions made no attempt to obtain information that is necessary to determine the level of recreational demand, e.g., recreational days, for various outdoor recreational activities.

Respondents indicated that fishing, hunting, overnight camping, and nature appreciation are four of the more important outdoor recreational activities to Carbon County residents. The importance of these outdoor recreational activities suggest that respondents and Carbon County residents hold a high value for outdoor recreational experiences in forest, riparian, wilderness, and other undeveloped areas. At the same time, it is also important to note that fishing activities also take place at various impoundments, e.g., Pathfinder Reservoir and Seminoe. Consequently, the importance of developed recreational opportunities for fishing is also significant to County residents' activities.

A second tier of important outdoor recreational activities included hiking, gardening, river rafting/boating, and horseback riding. The importance expressed for these activities indicate that Carbon County residents also participate in various recreational opportunities in other environmental settings such as rangelands, open prairie, and larger rivers such as the North Platte.

Responses indicated that winter recreational activities such as snowmobiling, downhill and cross-country skiing, and ice skating are considerably less in importance. Survey respondents clearly indicated, however, that the two more important winter recreational activities are snowmobiling and cross-country skiing. Since most of the resident surveys were completed by respondents in August, 1996, a summer orientation of survey respondents may have impacted the importance given for winter activities.

Land Use Management

Several questions in the survey were devoted to future land use management directions by both federal agencies and Carbon County government (Tables 3-11, 3-12, 3-13, and 3-14). These questions generally asked if more federal or County lands should be leased for various types of land uses and whether or not the County should encourage various types of land uses. While addressing different aspects of resource conservation and development, the responses also provide a useful "back-check" to other related questions in the survey.

Commercial Harvest of Timber in the Medicine Bow National Forest

Survey respondents were divided over whether or not the U.S. Forest Service should make more lands in the Medicine Bow National Forest available for the commercial harvest of timber (Table 3-11). Slightly over half of the respondents said that the Forest Service should not make more federal lands available for the commercial harvest of timber in the MBNF.

TABLE 3-9
RESIDENT SURVEY
BALANCE BETWEEN OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

Respondent	Which should be more important to Carbon County?			
Location	conserve land, water, and wildlife resources	increase oil and gas production	no response	other
Baggs	12	18	3	
Dixon	3	2	1	
Elk Mountain	5	3		
Encampment	8	9	2	
Hanna	4	6	1	
Medicine Bow	3	7	1	
Rawlins	97	47	12	
Riverside	7	8		1
Saratoga	36	17	5	
Sinclair	3	2	1	
Walcott		1		
No location	2	1		
Total Responses	180	121	26	1
Percent	54.9%	36.9%	7.9%	0.3%

Note: Some respondents indicated more than one response to this question.

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

**TABLE 3-10
RESIDENT SURVEY
IMPORTANCE OF OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL
OPPORTUNITIES**

Respondent	Which types of outdoor recreational opportunities are most important to you?												
Location	snow-mobiling	x-country skiing	downhill skiing	ice skating	hunting	fishing	hiking	gardenin g	river rafting/ boating	overnight camping	nature appreciat ion	horsebac k riding	other
	* Numbers below were statistically weighted												
Baggs	123	43	38	38	222	198	122	111	75	179	139	102	
Dixon	9			2	27	27	13	20	20	25	7	4	
Elk Mountain	19	18	19	27	47	49	23	30	27	29	36		30
Encampment	46	46	39	19	94	101	78	72	31	62	66	40	
Hanna	3	13	6	6	60	52	43	24	25	53	52	31	
Medicine Bow	7	7	7	3	71	51	13	18	8	40	52	24	
Rawlins	238	233	186	119	595	745	597	371	428	718	749	383	20
Riverside	5	32	17	2	47	78	53	68	27	71	75	13	
Saratoga	102	98	72	42	242	247	178	128	217	199	232	135	
Sinclair	13	6	14	5	24	40	32		34	31	36	13	
Walcott					10	9				8		7	
No location	8		1	2	10	14	8	16	3	18	10	5	
Total	573	496	399	265	1449	1611	1160	858	895	1433	1454	757	50
Percent	5.0%	4.4%	3.5%	2.3%	12.7%	14.1%	10.2%	7.5%	7.9%	12.6%	12.8%	6.6%	0.4%

*Note: More than one response was frequently given for this question. For this reason, responses were statistically weighted to gain a more accurate insight to survey responses.

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-11
RESIDENT SURVEY
LAND USE MANAGEMENT POLICIES CONCERNING FEDERAL LANDS

Respondent Location	Should more federal lands in the MBNF be made available to local timber companies for the commercial harvest of timber?				Should more federal lands in Carbon County be designated for public recreation?				Should more federal lands in Carbon County be leased for the commercial mining of local mineral resources?				Should more federal lands in Carbon County be designated for the purposes of conserving fish & wildlife habitat, as well as surface and ground-water resources?				Should more federal lands in Carbon County be leased to the oil and gas industry for exploration and production?			
	Yes	No	Other	No Response	Yes	No	Other	No Response	Yes	No	Other	No Response	Yes	No	Other	No Response	Yes	No	Other	No Response
Baggs	19	11		1	19	11		2	18	12		1	20	10		1	22	8		1
Dixon	3	3			3	2		1	3	3			4	2			4	2		
Elk Mountain	2	6			6	2			4	4			8				5	3		
Encampment	13	2		1	10	4		2	12	3		1	10	6		1	13	2		1
Hanna	6	4			5	5			7	3			8	2			6	3		1
Medicine Bow	4	4		3	8	2		1	7	2		2	5	4		2	8	1		2
Rawlins	54	83		11	95	31		14	64	62		15	109	23		9	60	90		12
Riverside	9	1		3	9	2		1	9	2		1	5	6		2	10	2		1
Saratoga	24	23		7	25	26		9	21	24		9	34	15		5	24	23		8
Sinclair	2	3		1	4	1		1	2	3		1	5			1	3	2		1
Walcott		1				1				1			1				1			
No Location	2	1	3		2	1	1		1	2	5		3		4		3		4	
Total Responses	138	142	3	27	186	88	1	31	148	121	5	30	212	68	4	21	159	136	4	27
Percent	44.5 %	45.8 %	1.0 %	8.7 %	60.8 %	28.8 %	0.3 %	10.1 %	48.7 %	39.8 %	1.6 %	9.9 %	69.5 %	22.3 %	1.3 %	6.9 %	48.8 %	41.7 %	1.2 %	8.3 %

Note: Some respondents indicated more than one response.

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

**TABLE 3-12
RESIDENT SURVEY
LAND USE MANAGEMENT POLICIES CONCERNING PRIVATE LANDS**

Respondent Location	Should Carbon County encourage greater residential expansion on private lands in the unincorporated areas?			Should Carbon County encourage the development of more commercial facilities on private lands in the County's unincorporated areas?			Should Carbon County encourage greater industrial investment and development on private lands in the unincorporated areas?			Should Carbon County encourage the development of more visitor accommodations on private lands in the County's unincorporated areas?			Should greater recreational access be given to residents through private lands?		
	Yes	No	No Response	Yes	No	No Response	Yes	No	No Response	Yes	No	No Response	Yes	No	No Response
Baggs	11	17	3	14	16	2	14	16	1	10	20	1	10	20	1
Dixon		5	1	2	3	1	1	4	1	1	5		3	3	
Elk Mountain	3	5		3	5		4	3	1	7	1		7	1	
Encampment	5	10	1	7	7	2	9	7	1	10	5	1	11	4	1
Hanna	5	5		7	3		7	3		9	1		6	4	
Medicine Bow	2	5	4	6	3	2	8	3	1	7	3	1	8	2	1
Rawlins	85	64	14	61	68	17	72	59	13	95	39	13	91	44	12
Riverside	8	4	1	10	2	1	11	1	1	9	4		6	6	1
Saratoga	16	31	7	17	29	9	31	22	5	32	18	5	27	20	8
Sinclair	1	4	1	4	1	1	4	2		5	1	1	5	1	
Walcott	1			1			1			1			1		
No Location	2	1		1	2		1	2			3		1	2	
Total Responses	139	151	32	133	139	35	163	122	24	186	100	22	176	107	24
Percent	43.2%	46.9%	9.9%	43.3%	45.3%	11.4%	52.8%	39.5%	7.8%	60.4%	32.5%	7.1%	57.3%	34.9%	7.8%

Note: Some respondents indicated more than one response.

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-13
RESIDENT SURVEY
CARBON COUNTY'S INVOLVEMENT IN LAND USE MANAGEMENT

Respondent Location	Should the Carbon County Planning Commission enforce land use zoning regulations more strictly?				Should Carbon County participate more or less in federal land decisions?			
	Yes	No	No preference	No response	More	Less	No preference	No response
Baggs	14	3	13	1	27	1	3	1
Dixon	2	1	3		5		1	
Elk Mountain	2	1	5		7		1	
Encampment	10	1	2	3	15	1	1	
Hanna	3	4	3		9		1	
Medicine Bow	5	1	5		6	1	2	1
Rawlins	57	19	56	12	101	5	30	8
Riverside	7	2	4		13			
Saratoga	28	10	14	3	46	1	6	2
Sinclair	2	2	2		5		1	
Walcott	1				1			
No Location		1	2		1	1	1	
Total Responses	131	45	109	19	236	10	47	12
Percent	43.1%	14.8%	35.9%	6.3%	77.4%	3.3%	15.4%	3.9%

Note: Some respondents indicated more than one response.

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-14
RESIDENT SURVEY
DESIRED LEVELS OF FUTURE POPULATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Respondent Location	How much population growth would you like to see occur in Carbon County during the next 20 years?					How much economic growth would you like to see occur in Carbon County during the next 20 years?				
	None	Very Little	Some growth	Significant growth	No response	None	Very Little	Some growth	Significant growth	No response
Baggs	4	4	20	2	1		2	20	8	1
Dixon	2	2	2				1	5		
Elk Mountain	2		5	1			1	4	3	
Encampment	2	2	11	1			2	10	4	
Hanna		1	5	4			1	5	4	
Medicine Bow			8	2	1			5	5	1
Rawlins	5	26	80	28	5	3	10	68	59	4
Riverside		1	11	1				8	5	
Saratoga	3	13	36	4	1	4	6	34	12	
Sinclair		1	5		1			5	1	
Walcott			1					1		
No Location		1		2				2	1	
Total Responses	18	51	184	45	9	7	23	167	102	6
Percent	5.9%	16.6%	59.9%	14.7%	2.9%	2.3%	7.5%	54.8%	33.4%	2.0%

Note: Some respondents indicated more than one response.

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

These results are consistent with responses to another question in the survey where roughly half of the respondents felt that increased governmental efforts are needed to conserve timber, wildlife, and water resources in the County. As stated earlier, it is believed that this response again suggests that residents of the County are seeking a balance between resource conservation and the use of timber resources.

Public Recreation on Federal Lands in Carbon County

About 61 percent of the survey respondents believe that more federal lands in Carbon County should be designated for public recreation (Table 3-11). Outdoor recreation is an important issue and a treasured opportunity for Carbon County residents.

Mining on Federal Lands in Carbon County

The future use of federal lands for commercial mining activity was viewed favorably by roughly 49 percent of survey respondents (Table 3-11). There is limited commercial mining activity occurring on federal lands in Carbon County. For this reason, commercial mining does not appear to be viewed as a threat to recreation on federal lands. At the same time, these results may, in part, reflect a perspective that commercial mining is a desirable economic activity in the County that generates positive benefits to local employment and income.

Conservation of Fish and Wildlife Habitat and Water Resources

The future use of federal lands for the conservation of fish and wildlife habitat, as well as water resources, was believed to be an important objective of survey respondents. Almost 70 percent of the respondents expressed this perspective (Table 3-11). This rate of response was higher than the other questions concerning future land use management.

The desire for greater resource conservation is one of several important messages from survey respondents. This need is likely based upon the experience of County residents who regularly observe wildlife in open space areas throughout the County. Further, County residents also have a strong appreciation of the County's limited rainfall characteristics, water requirements to support agriculture, and other environmental issues.

Oil and Gas Exploration and Production on Federal Lands

Almost 49 percent of the respondents indicated that they favored more leasing of federal lands for oil and gas exploration and production (Table 3-11). These results directly contradict responses to another question in the survey (see Table 3-9) where residents expressed that the conservation of land, water, and wildlife resources was more important than increased oil and gas production.

It is also interesting to note that respondents from the vicinity of Rawlins were the only geographical area of the County that clearly opposed greater oil and gas development on federal lands. Responses from Saratoga were divided almost equally for and against. All of the County's other communities favored the increase of such development.

Residential Expansion on Private Lands in Unincorporated Areas of County

In terms of future residential expansion, there is apparently a mixed feeling concerning the potential expansion of residential development on private lands in unincorporated areas of Carbon County. About 47 percent of the respondents expressed that they did not favor greater residential expansion in these areas of the County (Table 3-12). Forty-three percent favored residential expansion; roughly 10 percent provided no response.

Data gained from another question in the survey, as well as several public hearings in the County, may provide some insight to this attitude and concerns. After struggling to survive a serious economic downturn in the early 1980's, many local businesses have been anxious for a return of greater economic prosperity throughout the County. Such prosperity includes a vision by most residents for, at least, modest residential growth that will initially benefit the construction industry, retail trade, and professional services.

Some residents apparently believe that an increased resident population base represents an opportunity to establish an expanded tax base and consumer market for the Carbon County economy.

However, slightly more residents clearly do not favor residential expansion in the unincorporated areas of the County which, for the most part, represent rangeland, wildlife habitat, and scenic open space. Their responses may also signal a preference for residential expansion within or near the boundaries of the ten municipalities in Carbon County.

The Development of Commercial Facilities on Private Lands

Respondents generally held a split view concerning the development of commercial facilities on private lands (Table 3-12). Somewhat greater feelings against expanded commercial facilities came from respondents who lived in the vicinity of the communities of Rawlins, Elk Mountain, Saratoga, and Baggs. The strongest response against commercial development was from residents in the vicinity of Saratoga. Respondents from other communities such as Riverside, Hanna, Sinclair showed greater interest in the development of commercial facilities on private lands in the County.

These results suggest that most residents from the more urbanized areas of the County do not yearn for more commercial development and are generally satisfied with the level of convenience and services that are available. Where commercial facilities are considerably more limited, respondents view commercial expansion as an opportunity for greater convenience.

Industrial Investment and Development of Private Lands

The majority of respondents (53 percent) displayed a favorable opinion concerning industrial investment and development on private lands (Table 3-12). While residents hold value and concern for future resource conservation efforts, respondents apparently believe that potential industrial expansion will generate increased employment and household income opportunities.

It is interesting to note, however, that the favorable view toward industrial investment is held by all respondents from all communities except Baggs. Respondents from this community may believe that future industrial expansion is less important to their future because a variety of industrial job opportunities in the oil and gas industry are already available in the Washakie Basin.

Baggs respondents may also be responding to some of the realities associated with the oil and gas industry. The industry is quite cyclical. Employment is extremely variable as the industry responds to demand and price fluctuations. Many residents that seek higher job security and more consistent levels of wages have witnessed rises and falls of gas industry employment in the Little Snake River area.

Development of Visitor Accommodations on Private Lands

Results from the survey indicate that a majority of the survey respondents view the potential development of visitor accommodations on private lands as desirable (Table 3-12). However, such support was not evident throughout the County.

Strong support for visitor accommodations came from respondents that live in the vicinity of Rawlins, Saratoga, Encampment, Riverside, Hanna, Elk Mountain, Medicine Bow and Sinclair. In contrast, strong opposition was voiced by respondents from the Little Snake River area communities of Baggs and Dixon.

The opposition expressed toward the future development of visitor accommodations from the Little Snake River area suggests an interesting community perspective. The Little Snake River area clearly has an economy that includes, for the most part, smaller family-owned ranches and natural gas exploration. A declining population in the community has reduced the size of an already small consumer market. These trends continue to erode the availability of private commercial and public services in Baggs, and force residents to increasingly depend more upon the commercial services that are available in Craig, Colorado. These conditions typically suggest a need for greater economic diversity.

Recreational Access

A majority of respondents (57 percent) expressed desire to be given recreational access through private lands (Table 3-12). With the exception of Baggs, such support was evident from respondents throughout most of the County. Respondents from Dixon and Riverside expressed mixed feelings.

Increased recreational access is a frequent topic of discussion by a wide range of interests in Carbon County such as ranchers, resource managers, and persons seeking recreational opportunities. The overall indication of survey respondents parallels general demands that have been expressed in recent years for greater recreational access through public lands, as well as private lands that must be crossed to gain access to federal lands.

The concerns expressed by respondents from Riverside and Baggs probably reflect the response of many private landowners in Carbon County who have concern with public access through private lands. Informal discussions between Carbon County Planning and Development representatives with various local ranchers in Baggs and the Platte Valley invariably generate expressions of concern for liability to the private landowner, undesirable public littering, destruction of private property, and the costs associated with management. It is not surprising that these concerns are more prominent in Baggs and Riverside where a greater proportion of small ranches and landowners are situated near desirable hunting and fishing areas, as well as other recreational destinations.

Involvement of Carbon County in Federal Land Decisions and the Enforcement of County Zoning

One of the stronger responses to any question in the entire resident survey related to the involvement of Carbon County in federal land decisions. Approximately 77 percent of survey respondents said that they wanted the participation of Carbon County in federal land decisions (Table 3-13). A strong affirmative response was received from respondents in all communities of Carbon County.

An interesting correlation can be made with results from another question in the survey where respondents indicated that one of the more important land issues was too much government regulation of land uses (Table 3-5). Since respondents indicate that Carbon County should be involved in federal land decisions, it is clear that respondents are concerned with land decisions being made by federal agencies that administer federal lands in Carbon County.

This conclusion is also substantiated by responses to another question concerning whether or not the County Planning Commission should enforce land use and zoning regulations more strictly (Table 3-13). About 43 percent of the respondents wanted more zoning enforcement by the County; 36 percent had no preference, and 15 percent did not want more enforcement. Clearly, many respondents want County decision-makers to become involved in federal land use decisions. This community view is apparently based upon the perception that the involvement of local decision-makers in federal land use decisions, combined with greater accessibility to County officials, will motivate better federal land use decisions.

Future Population and Economic Growth in the Next 20 Years

Two questions in the survey address future population and economic growth during the next 20 years (Table 3-14). The majority of respondents (55 percent) favor some population and economic growth. A correlation of the responses to these questions suggests that respondents prefer increased economic growth to an expansion in resident population.

While the majority expressed desire for "some" population and economic growth, 15 to 33 percent of the respondents said they wanted "significant" population and economic growth. These respondents appear to be focused upon near term return of their respective investments of labor and financial resources. In addition, they may also represent a segment of County residents who struggled to survive during the downturn in the County economy in the early 1980's.

Overall, responses to these questions and other stated needs for resource conservation show considerable foresight and wisdom by the survey respondents. In essence, it is evident that survey

respondents are calling for a balancing of economic and population growth with the continued management of water, land, and wildlife resources.

RANCH SURVEY

Methodology

Pedersen Planning Consultants prepared the ranch survey form. The survey was intended to help the County Planning Commission, the Board of County Commissioners, and the consultant gain a better understanding of various land use issues that confront the ranching community in Carbon County.

The ranch survey was distributed to all attendees of public hearings that were held in March and August 1996. Surveys were distributed to meeting attendees, who were residents of Carbon County and presently owners and/or operators of a ranch in the County, as they arrived at one of several public meeting locations. Every effort was made to ensure that only one representative completed a ranch survey for any ranch in the County. Additional surveys were passed out and collected during the course of the meeting prior to any discussion of issues by local residents.

Many of the ranch surveys were completed by residents who attended the County Fair in Rawlins, Wyoming in August 1996. Persons approaching the booth were asked if they had previously completed a ranch survey to avoid any redundancy in resident views and concerns. They were encouraged to complete the surveys and were advised that they might win a free \$25 gift certificate from Bubba's Bar-B-Q in Saratoga.

In order to gain a greater response to the survey, a mailing list of all ranches in the County was obtained from the County's Cooperative Extension Office in early 1997. Survey forms were distributed to the entire mailing list unless a completed survey had already been received. Ranchers were invited to respond to the survey if they had not already provided a response during the 1996 public hearings or the County Fair in August, 1996. In addition, ranchers were requested to provide a completed survey from only one person who was responsible for the ranch operation. This approach virtually doubled the total amount of completed surveys collected by the County Planning Department.

Survey results were initially tabulated manually to facilitate a review of written responses. Subsequently, survey results were summarized in tabular form to facilitate the efficient evaluation and presentation of survey results. To the extent possible, survey results were tabulated on a geographical basis to help evaluate potential regional differences and concerns. However, 24 of the 85 completed surveys (28 percent) did not indicate the location of the ranch since this information was identified as "optional". The County Department of Planning and Development wanted respondents to feel as comfortable as possible because of the sensitive and confidential nature of some questions that were contained in the survey.

Characteristics of Survey Respondents

Sample Size

Representatives from 85 ranches in Carbon County completed ranch surveys for the Carbon County Land Use Plan. Available data from the Carbon County Extension Office indicates that there are approximately 286 ranches in Carbon County. Consequently, the sample size represented roughly 30 percent of all ranches in Carbon County. This sample size is believed to be a statistically valid sample that provided pertinent information for the Land Use Plan.

Location of Responding Ranches in Carbon County

Twenty-one of the 85 (25 percent) completed surveys did not indicate the location of the ranch since this information was identified as "optional". The Department of Planning and Development wanted respondents to feel comfortable as possible because of the sensitive and confidential nature of some questions that were contained in the survey.

Twenty-one of the 85 (25 percent) completed surveys did not indicate the location of the ranch since this information was identified as “optional”. The Department of Planning and Development wanted respondents to feel comfortable as possible because of the sensitive and confidential nature of some questions that were contained in the survey.

Respondents who identified the general location of their ranches suggest that there was a desirable distribution from ranches throughout Carbon County. Responses indicated that surveys were completed for ranches located near Baggs, Dixon, Savery, Elk Mountain, Arlington, Medicine Bow, Walcott Junction, Encampment, Riverside, and Saratoga. Two of the ranches in the Little Snake River area included ranches that incorporated lands in both Wyoming and Colorado.

Length of Ranch Operation

It is well known that cattle ranching in Carbon County has a long history that began in the late 19th century and continued for over 100 years. This was confirmed by ranch survey respondents. The cumulative average for all ranches that responded to the survey was approximately 64 years of historical ranch operation (Table 3-15). While most of the ranches have had a long history in Carbon County, about seven percent of the ranch respondents indicated that their ranch has been in operation for less than seven years.

Ranch Ownership

About 68 percent of the ranches who responded to the survey are owned by families or family-owned corporations. Twelve percent are sole proprietors; an additional nine percent represent partnerships.

Approximately five percent of the responding ranches are owned by corporations that are based outside of Wyoming. About four percent of the respondents said their ranches were owned by other Wyoming corporations. The remaining ranch representatives indicate that their ranch represented another type of ownership.

Size of Ranch Operations

Ranch respondents were asked to provide general information concerning the size of their ranches in terms of acreage and the number of available AUMs (Table 3-15). This question was asked in the context of both private lands and federal allotments.

Ranch respondents indicated a wide range of ranch sizes and allotments. The average size reflected from these responses indicated an average ranch size of approximately 28,689 acres, or almost 45 sections of land. The working capacity of the ranch averaged approximately 3,660 animal unit months.

Roughly 70 percent of the ranch lands owned by the responding ranches are privately owned. The remainder are leased from the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, or other private landowners.

Reliance Upon Federal Lands for Ranching

About 58 percent of the ranch representatives indicated that 1995 ranch operations included the pasture of cattle on federal lands that are administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management. In 1995, each of these ranches pastured an average of about 1,567 AUMs on their BLM allotments.

When correlated with average number of AUMs on each ranch, the importance of grazing on federal lands that are administered by BLM becomes evident. This correlation indicates that roughly 43 percent of the cattle grazing by BLM permittee operations takes place on BLM allotments. It may also

**TARIF 3-15
RANCH SURVEY
HISTORY AND OWNERSHIP**

	Average	Percent
1. Roughly how many years has this ranch been in operation?	64 years	
2. Who owns the ranch?		
my family		41%
family-owned corporation		27%
self, sole proprietorship		12%
partnership		9%
other Wyoming corporation		4%
other outside Wyoming corporation		5%
other		2%
no response		0%
3. What is the size of the ranch (including private and federal allotments)?		
no. of acres	28,689	
no. of AUMs	3,660	
4. What percent is privately-owned?		70%
5. How many AUMs did the ranch pasture sheep or cattle in 1995?		
Cattle: USFS	609	
Cattle: BLM	1,567	
Sheep: USFS	0	
Sheep: BLM	296	
Other	0	
6. How many cows and sheep owned in 1995?		
Number of cattle	667	
Number of sheep	1,489	
7. How many additional animals not owned by ranch were grazed in the summer of 1995?		
Number of cattle	1,047	
Number of sheep	3,075	
8. Does the ranch have any other agricultural activities that support the lifestyle of people living and working at the ranch?		
raise poultry		3%
raise hogs		5%
maintain horses		31%
garden		8%
4-H projects		17%
other		22%
no response		14%
9. How much money was spent in 1995 to operate ranch?	\$154,141	
10. Roughly, what % of gross 1995 ranch expenses were spent in Carbon County?	\$95,574	62%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

suggest that a number of ranchers are not using all of the AUMs that they may have available via prior leasing agreements.

Survey results suggest that about 20 percent of the ranches in Carbon County operate, in part, on federal allotments that are administered by the U.S. Forest Service. In 1995, each ranch that operated on Forest Service allotments pastured an average of 609 AUMs. The average number of AUMs managed by Forest Service permittees in Carbon County suggest that about 17 percent of the grazing by these permittees occurs on their Forest Service allotments.

In terms of sheep production, only four percent of the ranch representatives reported that they used federal grazing allotments for the pasture of sheep. These ranches pastured an average of 296 AUMs of BLM allotments in 1995. None of the ranch representatives indicated that they leased Forest Service allotments for the pasture of sheep. The low number of responses by ranchers who were involved in sheep production likely distorted the average number of AUMs because a typical band of sheep represents, at least, 1,500 sheep.

Cattle Production in 1995

Eighty-one percent of the ranches reported cattle ownership in 1995. The average number of cattle owned by these ranches in Carbon County was approximately 667 head (Table 3-15).

The pasturage of other animals not owned by local ranches is also a significant part of the ranching business in Carbon County. About 32 percent of the ranch representatives indicated that they grazed an average of about 1,047 cattle, which they did not own, during the summer of 1995,. Perhaps more significant, the average number of animals imported into Carbon County for summer pasture by 27 ranchers exceeded the average number of livestock that were owned by local ranches. Consequently, the summer pasture of cattle not owned by local ranches is an important economic mainstay for about 32 percent of all Carbon County ranchers.

Sheep Production

Survey responses suggested that about 13 percent of the ranches in Carbon County own some sheep. The average number of sheep that was owned by these ranches in 1995 was about 1,489 sheep. This represents only about one band of sheep.

Sheep production was once a dominant enterprise in Carbon County. However, survey responses indicate that this agricultural enterprise has dwindled to a limited number of sheep producers who primarily see sheep production as a supplemental source of ranch income.

Other Activities that Support People Living and Working on Local Ranches

The size, location, and accessibility of many ranches in Carbon County encourages or requires many ranches to engage in other agricultural activities that support the lifestyle of family members and employees that live and work at the ranch. The maintenance of horses for work and recreation is the primary activity that was identified by ranch representatives (Table 3-15). The participation of family members in 4-H projects was also an important activity that is clearly aimed at helping younger family members learn more about various aspects of agriculture. Participation in gardening; poultry, pork, and honey bee production; and hunting are supplemental activities that help increase the self-sufficiency of ranch operations, as well as decrease the cost of living for ranching families.

Contribution of Ranching to the Carbon County Economy

Ranching activities in Carbon County provide direct and indirect employment and income to the Carbon County economy. The ranch survey sought, in part, to obtain data that could help quantify how many jobs are typically generated by local ranches, how much money is expended inside Carbon County for ranch operations, and what proportion of total operational costs are expended inside Carbon County.

In terms of employment, survey responses suggest that an average of three to four persons (including family members) work full-time on local ranches in Carbon County (Table 3-16). Full-time employment is somewhat greater from July through September.

While seasonal or part-time employment opportunities are available at local ranches, ranch representatives indicated that not more than two to three persons typically support the efforts of the full-time labor force at each ranch. Seasonal employment is higher during the July through September period when ranch activities are the greatest.

Ranch representatives indicated that ranches in Carbon County expend an average of approximately \$154,151 to support ranch operations (Table 3-15). Such costs include a variety of expenditures such as labor, feed supplies, equipment, taxes, and other direct costs. About \$95,574 of the total annual expenditures (approximately 62 percent) are spent inside Carbon County to support ranch operations.

The U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis indicated that there were 286 ranches in Carbon County in 1994; the County Agricultural Extension representative reports that this number of ranches remains in operation at the time of this report (Reynolds, 1996). Consequently, the ranching industry annually contributes approximately \$27.3 million of direct employment and operational expenditures to the County economy.

Sources of Income from Other Ranch Activities

The economic viability of approximately 66 percent of the ranches in Carbon County is dependent upon other sources or income that supplement cattle production (Table 3-16). Survey results also indicate that the primary supplemental activities include hunting and guiding activities, as well as oil and gas production royalties (Table 3-16). Secondly, other supplemental sources of income are obtained through the collection of recreational access or trespass fees, hay production, timber harvests, and guest ranch operations.

Future Plans of Ranches in Carbon County

A majority of ranch representatives (61 percent) envisioned that their ranch would continue to operate for more than 20 years (Table 3-17). About 20 percent of the respondents said their ranch would operate during the next 10 to 20 years. In contrast, several ranchers (7 percent) envisioned that their operations would not continue to operate beyond five years. The overall response suggests that there is considerable desire and commitment by the ranches to continue operations. At the same time, a decline in ranching can be anticipated during the next 20 years as existing ranchers retire from the business.

Despite some community concern for the future subdivision of privately owned ranch lands in Carbon County, 89 percent of the ranch representatives said that they had no intent to subdivide ranch lands. The majority of those remaining respondents, who said that future subdivision activity was anticipated, reported that any future subdivision activity would involve the sale of land parcels greater than 35 acres. Extremely limited interest was demonstrated for the sale of parcels that are less than 35 acres in size.

Changes in the Relationship with the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service

Approximately 44 percent of the ranch representatives said that changes should be made in the way the Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service cooperate with federal allotment permittees (Table 3-18). These respondents made a variety of recommendations.

Recommendations that were provided emphasized that BLM and the Forest Service need to understand that their decisions have economic impact upon the collective Carbon County community. Others spoke of a protagonist and antagonist relationship that needs to be replaced by greater agency understanding, cooperation, and a desire to work together with local ranchers. It was pointed out that federal agency representatives would gain a better understanding of grazing issues if greater attempts were made to listen to ranchers who have considerably more experience from working on the land.

TABLE 3-16
RANCH SURVEY
PRESENT OPERATION

	<i>Average</i>	<i>Percent</i>
1. How many persons typically work full-time on the ranch (including family members)?		
January-March	3	
April-June	3	
July-September	4	
October-December	3	
2. How many persons work only seasonally, or part-time?		
January - March	2	
April-June	2	
July-September	3	
October-December	2	
3. How many families live on the ranch full-time?	2	
4. How many persons live on the ranch full-time?	6	
5. From what activities does the ranch derive income from other than cattle ranching?		
sheep production		7%
gravel/quarry operation		7%
oil/gas production		10%
hunting/guiding		19%
guest ranch/visitor accommodations		4%
hog production		0%
trespass fee		6%
other		13%
no response		34%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

**TABLE 3-17
RANCH SURVEY
FUTURE PLANS OF THE RANCH**

	<i>Percent</i>
<p>1. All things considered, the ranch expects to remain in cattle ranching for:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">no longer than the next five years</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the next ten years</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the next 15 years</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the next 20 years</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">more than 20 years</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">other</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">no response</p>	<p>7%</p> <p>7%</p> <p>7%</p> <p>6%</p> <p>61%</p> <p>4%</p> <p>8%</p>
<p>2. If the ranch stays in operation, the ranch expects that future ranch ownership and/or management would be performed by:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">children or other relatives of present owners</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">existing or future ranch manager that may be hired directly by the ranch</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">existing owners</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">other</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">no response</p>	<p>44%</p> <p>11%</p> <p>33%</p> <p>4%</p> <p>8%</p>
<p>3. During the next five years, does the ranch have any intention of subdividing its privately-owned lands?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">yes</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">no</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">no response</p>	<p>7%</p> <p>89%</p> <p>4%</p>
<p>4. If yes, for what purpose(s) would the ranch be subdivided?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">provide or give land to other family members or relatives for future residence and ranching</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">sale of land to family/relative</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">sale of land parcel(s), greater than 35 acres</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">sale of land parcel(s), less than 35 acres</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">industrial development project</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">other</p>	<p>10%</p> <p>0%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>20%</p> <p>10%</p> <p>10%</p>

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-18 RANCH SURVEY LAND MANAGEMENT	
	<i>Percent</i>
1. Should any changes be made in the way BLM and the U.S. Forest Service cooperate with permittees in Carbon County who use their allotment(s) for cattle and/or sheep production? yes no no response	 44% 32% 24%
2. How much should Carbon County participate in Federal allotment decisions? not at all a little some a great deal no response	 3% 4% 26% 55% 12%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

Participation of Carbon County in Federal Allotment Decisions

Until recently, Carbon County has had little to no involvement in federal allotment decisions in Carbon County. Ranch representatives showed significant support for Carbon County's participation in federal grazing allotment decisions.

Fifty-five percent of the survey respondents expressed that the County should provide a great deal of support in these decisions (Table 3-15). Twenty percent of the respondents said that some support should be given. The remaining indicated that they preferred that the County participated little or not at all in federal allotment decisions.

SMALL BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY

Methodology

Pedersen Planning Consultants prepared the small business owner survey that was distributed for the purposes of the Land Use Plan. The survey was intended to help the County Planning Commission, the Board of County Commissioners, and the consultant gain a better understanding of various issues that confront small businesses throughout Carbon County, as well as their contribution to the Carbon County economy.

The small business owner survey was distributed to all persons who attended public hearings that were held in March and August 1996. Surveys were distributed to meeting attendees who were residents of Carbon County and presently owners and/or operators of a small business in Carbon County. Every effort was made to ensure that only one representative completed a small business for any small business enterprise in the County. Additional surveys were passed out and collected during the course of the meeting prior to any discussion of issues by local residents.

Many of the small business owner surveys were completed by residents who attended the County Fair in Rawlins, Wyoming. Persons approaching the booth were asked if they had previously completed a small business owner survey to avoid any redundancy in views and concerns. They were encouraged to complete the surveys and were advised that they might win a free \$25 gift certificate from Bubba's Bar-B-Q in Saratoga.

A third effort involved the distribution of small business surveys to members of the Rawlins-Carbon County Chamber of Commerce, Saratoga Chamber, Bow Area Economic Development, and Encampment-Riverside Merchants Association. This effort occurred in January 1997. Recipients of the survey were advised not to complete the survey if they, or another representative of their company, had completed the same survey in late 1996.

Survey results were initially tabulated manually to facilitate a review of written responses. Subsequently, survey results were summarized in tabular form to enhance the evaluation and presentation of survey results. To the extent possible, survey results were tabulated on a geographical basis to help analyze potential regional differences and concerns

Characteristics of Survey Respondents

Sample Size

Representatives from 122 small businesses in Carbon County completed small business owner surveys for the Carbon County Land Use Plan. In 1994, there were approximately 526 small business establishments in Carbon County (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1994). No business exceeded 240 employees; in fact, about 82 percent of these establishments in Carbon County employed less than 10 persons.

Since 1994, it is believed that there has been limited change in the total number of small businesses in Carbon County. Using this assumption, the 122 completed surveys represent a response from about 23

percent of all small businesses in Carbon County. Consequently, the sample size is believed to be a statistically valid sample that provides pertinent information for the Land Use Plan.

Location of Responding Small Businesses in Carbon County

The small business owner survey asked respondents to provide the name and general location of their businesses. These questions were clearly noted as “optional” responses to respect the anonymity of respondents and to recognize the confidential nature of some survey responses. All small business owners that responded to the survey identified, at least, the location of their small business (Table 3-19).

TABLE 3-19 LOCATION OF RESPONDING SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS SMALL BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY		
Community	Number of Responses	Proportion of All Responses (percent)
Baggs	6	5
Dixon	4	3
Elk Mountain	3	2
Encampment/Riverside	23	19
Hanna	4	3
Medicine Bow	6	5
Rawlins	32	26
Saratoga	39	32
Savery	2	2
Sinclair	2	2
Slater, Colorado	1	1
All Communities	122	100 %

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

Survey responses were made from businesses from throughout Carbon County. However, it should be noted that significantly high proportions of responses were completed by small business owners from the Platte Valley communities of Saratoga, Encampment, and Riverside. From a statistical perspective, a more ideal distribution of survey responses would have included a slightly greater number of completed surveys from Rawlins in order to reflect the higher proportion of business establishments in this community.

Length of Small Business Ownership

Survey results indicated that the average length of ownership by small business owners was approximately 15 years.

Type of Small Businesses Represented by Survey Respondents

Survey responses were made by a variety of small businesses. The types of businesses represented by the responding small business owners primarily included persons involved in retail trade, contract construction, finance, insurance and real estate services, as well as hotel, motel and other visitor accommodations (Table 3-20). Small business owners of other types of businesses included wholesale trade, manufacturing, transportation, and communications.

TABLE 3-20
SMALL BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY
HISTORY/LOCATION

Respondent Location	Years owned business Avg #/years	Type(s) of business(es) owned and operated in Carbon County										
		retail trade	wholesale trade	finance/ real estate insurance	profession al services	hotel/mote l visitor modations	contract constructio n	transporta- tion/com- munication	mining	manufac- turing	timber harvesting	other
Baggs		1	1	1	1		1					1
Dixon		1					1	1				1
Elk Mountain		1	1					1		1		1
Encampment		5	1	2		2	5			3	3	7
Hanna		1			1							2
Medicine Bow		4	1	2								1
Rawlins		14	2	7	4	3	4	1		1		9
Riverside		3		1		1				1		3
Saratoga		17	4	5	7	6	8		1	1		4
Sinclair												2
Savery		1				2	1	1				1
No Location			1									
Total Responses	15 years	48	11	18	13	14	20	4	1	7	3	32
Percent		28.1%	6.4%	10.5%	7.6%	8.2%	11.7%	2.3%	0.6%	4.1%	1.8%	18.7%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

Small business owners involved in retail trade represented 28 percent of all respondents. This type of enterprise was the primary enterprise of those owners that responded to the survey.

Contribution of Small Business Operations to the Carbon County Economy

Results from the survey indicate that small businesses in Carbon County employ an average of two full-time employees and one part-time employee (Table 3-21).

The average annual operation expenses for small businesses in Carbon County are approximately \$346,505 (Table 3-21). Approximately 63 percent of this amount, or \$218,298, remains in Carbon County via the expenditures of small business.

Assuming the operation of about 526 small businesses in Carbon County, it can be estimated that small business activities contribute almost \$114.8 million dollars to the Carbon County economy via direct employment and operational expenditures.

Constraints to Small Business Operations in Carbon County

In terms of future land use planning, one important consideration is to examine any significant factors that may constrain small business operations. Approximately 77 percent of the small business owners reported there were significant factors that constrained their business (Table 3-22). The primary factors identified as significant constraints included:

- the limited consumer market in Carbon County,
- the distance to suppliers of goods and materials,
- the general business and economic climate, and,
- competition from businesses outside of Carbon County.

Other factors included the inability to hire and/or retain qualified and desirable employees, inability to secure adequate operating capital, the lack of commercial space, and the lack of commercial-zoned property. However, these constraints were clearly secondary to the top four factors.

Future Viability of Small Business in Carbon County

From a land use planning perspective, the survey also asked small business owners what Carbon County could do to help improve the viability of their own businesses (Table 3-23). A wide variety of responses emerged from this survey question.

The leading recommendation from 24 percent of respondents was to encourage improvements to the visual quality of commercial signage along County roads and State highways.

Seventeen percent of the small business owners recommended that more land in Carbon County's unincorporated areas should be designated for residential or commercial purposes. Six percent of the small business owners indicated that the County should encourage local municipalities to zone more lands for commercial purposes. In contrast, about 10 percent of the respondents did not want to see the County or municipalities designate more lands for commercial purposes.

About 12 percent of the small business owners said that the County should not do any more or less than what it is already doing.

TABLE 3-21
SMALL BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY
CONTRIBUTION TO CARBON COUNTY ECONOMY

	<i>Average</i>	<i>Percent</i>
4. In 1995, your business employed (including self and family): Number of full-time employees Number of part-time employees	3 2	
5. In 1995, your total operating expenses were about (\$).	\$346,505	
6. In 1995, approximately what % of business operating costs were spent in Carbon County?		63%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-22
SMALL BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY
BUSINESS CONCERNS

		<i>Percent</i>
7.	Are there any significant factors that constrain your business?	
	yes	77%
	no	23%
8.	If you answered yes to question 7, please check one or more of the following reasons that are applicable to your business.	
	lack of available commercial-zoned property	3%
	lack of developed commercial space that can be leased	3%
	inability to secure adequate operating/investment capital from banks in Carbon County	5%
	limited consumer market in Carbon County	22%
	general business and economic climate	15%
	inability to hire and/or retain qualified and desirable employees	9%
	competition from other businesses outside Carbon County	11%
	the distance of suppliers of goods and materials	17%
	other	14%
	no response	1%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

TABLE 3-23
SMALL BUSINESS OWNER SURVEY
FUTURE VIABILITY OF YOUR BUSINESS

		<i>Percent</i>
<hr/>		
10.	From a land use planning perspective, what can Carbon County do to help improve the viability of your business?	
	designate more land in Carbon County's unincorporated areas for commercial purposes	8%
	designate more land in Carbon County's unincorporated areas for greater residential purposes	9%
	encourage municipalities of Carbon County to zone more lands for commercial purposes	6%
	County should not do anything more or less than what it is already doing	12%
	discourage the designation of more land in Carbon County's unincorporated areas for commercial purposes	6%
	discourage the municipalities of Carbon County to zone more lands for commercial purposes	4%
	encourage improvements to the visual quality of commercial signage along County roads and State highways	24%
	other	25%
	no response	6%
<hr/>		
11.	What should the County focus its future economic development efforts on?	
	improving the viability of timber, ranching, oil/gas, mining	28%
	keeping existing small business operations viable	32%
	attracting new industries	24%
	attracting more businesses in the service sector of the economy	13%
	none of the above	1%
	other	2%

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

The Focus of Future Economic Development

Small business owners expressed strong support for keeping small businesses and the five primary industries of Carbon County viable. The respondents also recognized the importance of attracting new industries into the Carbon County economy.

There was significantly less support for the attraction of new industries and more businesses in the service sector of the economy.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Methodology

Two rounds of four public hearings were held in March and August of 1996 at several public locations throughout the County (Table 3-24). Attendance records from the hearings indicate that approximately 155 residents attended these meetings. Public attendance was supplemented by the attendance and participation of County Planning Commission members, the Board of County Commissioners, and the County Department of Planning and Development staff.

Public notice was made through advertisements in the Rawlins Daily Times and the Saratoga Sun. Schedules of the meetings were also posted at various public places and business establishments throughout the County. Various news articles in the Saratoga Sun and Rawlins Daily Times also mentioned and discussed the scope of upcoming meetings.

TABLE 3-24 CARBON COUNTY LAND USE PLAN Public Meeting Schedule		
Date	Location	Attendance
March 18, 1996	Medicine Bow Village Square Medicine Bow, Wyoming	19
March 19, 1996	Little Snake River School Baggs, Wyoming	26
March 20, 1996	Jeffrey Center Rawlins, Wyoming	31
March 21, 1996	Saratoga Town Hall Saratoga, Wyoming	31
August 7, 1996	Elk Mountain Town Hall Elk Mountain, Wyoming	11
August 8, 1996	Sinclair Town Hall Sinclair, Wyoming	5
August 19, 1996	Little Snake River School Baggs, Wyoming	10
August 20, 1996	Encampment Town Hall Encampment, Wyoming	22

Note: Public meeting attendance statistics do not include representatives of the Carbon County Board of Commissioners, the Carbon County Planning Commission, or Planning Commission staff.

Source: Pedersen Planning Consultants, 1997

The selected general meeting schedule was made to encourage the attendance of residents and part-time residents, as well as the general public. Meeting schedules during late winter and late summer were also influenced by the availability of public facilities.

The public meetings typically opened with a welcoming of meeting attendees and a general description of the purpose and scope of the public meeting. A 15 to 20-minute slide presentation followed which outlined the general scope of the Carbon County Land Use Plan, the planning process, and how residents and the general public could become involved in the planning process during preparation of the Land Use Plan.

An informal discussion process was subsequently used during each of these meetings to enable residents to identify issues, concerns and recommendations for a variety of discussion topics. Comments from local residents were compiled by a planning staff member during each meeting and later reviewed by planning staff for evaluation. Public discussions during the meetings were also recorded via audio and/or video tape recording to facilitate future reviews of this information.

In the following paragraphs, the issues and concerns that were identified and discussed in each of the meetings are summarized by topic. The issues and concerns are not presented in any order of priority or emphasis.

March 18, 1996 Public Meeting Medicine Bow, Wyoming

Population and Residential Growth

The general consensus of those residents discussing this topic is that they view future population and residential growth as desirable. However, the desirability of that growth is dependent upon a number of related conditions:

1. Future growth should be planned for all communities in Carbon County.
2. Each community in the County should provide their own infrastructure, e.g., water systems, but not build what they cannot handle.
3. Incoming residents need to be working people, or have an adequate source of income.
4. Potential incoming residents, identified as transitional, are not welcome.
5. Incoming residents who are committed to Carbon County are welcome.

It was also pointed out that the evaluation of future population growth should consider the periodic boom and bust cycles that characterize the Carbon County economy.

Infrastructure/Public Services

Residents who voiced issues regarding infrastructure and public services indicated that there is a growing need for more lands to handle wastewater treatment and solid waste disposal. At the same time, it was pointed out that community recycling would reduce the amount of land required for a sanitary landfill, as well as generate some revenue from the sale of recyclable materials.

It was recommended that each community in Carbon County should look at the possibility to establish their own recycling centers. In this evaluation, each community should be certain that there is a market before launching into any recycling facility.

Residents that discussed medical facilities said that medical facilities are currently adequate. They are also pleased that most communities in the County have some sort of local clinics or dispensary facilities. Distance to the County Memorial Hospital in Rawlins is not considered a problem; residents are accustomed to traveling greater distances and combining business, shopping, and other family matters in one trip.

Public safety was identified as a concern by some present. Smaller communities need more help for police, fire, and emergency medical services.

One resident of Medicine Bow indicated that the Medicine Bow area holds considerable potential for wind energy. Those present were supportive of plans by Kenetech to make use of those resources. However, wind energy structures more than 50-feet high can adversely impact other wind energy

turbines that are one or two miles downwind. It was pointed out that local communities might wish to integrate wind energy from a locally operated system.

Environment

The residents present expressed a philosophy of wise use in terms of natural resources. While residents clearly are concerned with aesthetics and the conservation of resources, those present were concerned that the economic viability of Carbon County and their communities were maintained. Some persons suggested that Man is becoming an endangered specie.

Economy

The regional economy of Carbon County was identified as the following industries:

- oil and gas development
- timber
- mining
- ranching
- transportation
- recreation

One speaker suggested that businesses that support our industries need to be encouraged.

The area north of Medicine Bow contains a large amount of fossils that should be kept in the County. There is only one paleontologist in Wyoming and no curation because of an apparent lack in public funding. These fossils are important and their presence in Carbon County could promote local tourism.

Recreation represents an industry that has potential to grow.

Manufacturing also represents an opportunity for producers of computers and other goods and material. The County offers excellent transportation advantages via I-80 and the UP Railroad. However, others expressed that existing rail freight rates were generally too high. It was suggested that UP Railroad had limited concern for Carbon County and would likely do little to reduce freight rates.

In terms of transportation, one speaker indicated that growth in the transportation industry could be achieved by the encouragement of a railroad car cleaning facility.

When asked how cattle ranching could become more viable, residents indicated that the importation of beef and sheep products into the County should be eliminated. The incorporation of tourism into some ranches was also recommended as one approach to improving the viability of ranching. The establishment of a meat processing plant and/or a cooperative might also enhance the return to individual ranchers.

The cottonwood tree was identified as an opportunity for establishing a wood chip industry. Another speaker suggested that the cottonwood tree represents an important source of nutrients for local water resources.

Hog production was not viewed as a feasible economic opportunity for small family-operated enterprises. This agricultural activity was considered feasible only for larger, corporate operations. Residents need to purchase more Wyoming products in Wyoming, rather than shopping in Colorado and other locations. Small businesses in Carbon County need to be supported. National retail outlets such as Kmart and Wal-Mart are too big and are killing small business. Another resident suggested that the people in Carbon County might lack community pride and that perhaps greater attention should be devoted to changing community attitudes.

Rather than looking outside of Carbon County, it was recommended that private businesses and government concentrate on what resources we already have in Carbon County. The development of these community assets was seen to be essential to increased product development and marketing.

March 19 Public Meeting Baggs, Wyoming

Land Use Management

One speaker suggested that the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are not taking adequate consideration of public concerns as they develop resource management plans.

Permittee allotment requirements are changed with little or no discussion with permittees.

Commensurate property is eliminated from the permittee.

Federal land regulations and natural resource management should be managed locally at the County and State level. Federal regulations that accompany national environmental statutes do not take into account variable environmental conditions.

It was expressed that the State Game and Fish Department has a significant impact in the Little Snake River area. There is a need to coordinate planning activities with them. It was recommended that the County be in one administrative district rather than three.

Population and Residential Growth

One speaker indicated that the community wants new residents who are committed to Baggs, Wyoming.

One speaker indicated that he would prefer minimum growth in the Little Snake River area, but recognizes that we need to achieve economic viability. Another resident echoed the desire for minimum growth to allow basic public and commercial services to continue.

Future development should be kept as close as possible to incorporated boundaries of existing towns to keep from building residential subdivisions all over the place. The potential merging of small towns in the County via potential strip development along existing highways was also identified as a concern.

The future availability of water was identified as a primary concern in terms of where future residential growth should occur. One speaker noted that the Little Snake River area needs more water if it is to attract more people.

Floodplain designations developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) will dictate future development and growth.

Environment

Ranchers are good environmentalists. If they were not, they would not still be in operation.

Economy

Oil and Gas Development and Production

Without oil and gas development, the Little Snake River area will be hurting economically. Consequently, the Land Use Plan should encourage more oil and gas development.

Labor Force

A survey of high school seniors from Little Snake River Schools indicates that most high school graduates from Baggs-Dixon-Savery do not remain in the County. The primary reason given was that there is nothing for them to do in terms of employment opportunities. This same concern was raised by other students who were present in the audience. One graduating senior, however, indicated that he intended to stay in the County to work in ranching.

Other students indicated they wanted to leave to receive a college education, see the world, and make a fortune. Some students said that they would eventually like to come back and live in Carbon County.

When asked what would keep our kids here, various speakers (including students) from the audience suggested that work opportunities in ranching, as well as oil and gas, a better economy, and opportunities to start small businesses might slow the migration of these residents outside of Carbon County.

Others expressed a need for diversification in the local economy that would include ranching with other viable industries and businesses.

Commercial Services and Retail Trade

One speaker would like to see the establishment of more cottage industries in the community. It was mentioned that a home-based computer business would also provide a needed local service.

Infrastructure/Public Services

Residents who voiced issues regarding infrastructure and public services indicated that they are generally accustomed to traveling a distance to receive various public services. However, some facilities and services were recommended.

The availability of various social and public services in the Little Snake River area would be desirable.

One speaker recommended an expansion of a library in Baggs.

It was suggested that representatives of the County Motor Vehicle Licensing office should come to Baggs more frequently.

March 20, 1996 Public Meeting Rawlins, Wyoming

Population and Residential Growth

The general consensus of those residents discussing this topic is that they view future population and residential growth as desirable. However, the desirability of that growth is dependent upon a number of related conditions:

1. Future growth should occur in areas of the County where public services can easily be provided.
2. The population grows between 2 and 5 percent per year.
3. Population growth is distributed throughout all municipalities.
4. Growth will be proportionate to existing population distributions in each municipality, as well as the capability of each municipality to service an incoming population.

One speaker believed that a desirable County population would be approximately 21,000 residents. Population growth is expected to be a consequence of economic growth in the County.

Environment

One speaker noted that Wyoming is the environment. This is the type of place where natural resources, wildlife, beautiful vistas, and other resources abound.

Wide-open views are one of the County's important assets. For example, beautiful open space views are located north of Rawlins; mountain views can be seen from north of Encampment.

Maintain our natural resources.

Economy

Commercial Services and Retail Trade

One speaker would like to see Kmart or Wal-Mart come to Rawlins. These stores would provide better shopping opportunities.

The availability of local air commuter service to Denver is needed. In terms of ground transportation, a taxi would also be desirable.

Industry

Expand and stabilize existing industries that are presently in Carbon County.
Encourage the establishment of small, home-based industries.

Future economic development efforts should take advantage of the County's proximity to Interstate 80. For example, the location of Budweiser distributorship would be enhanced by this transportation advantage.

Encourage greater manufacturing activity.

Cattle Ranching and Agriculture

Improve the viability of ranching through continued lobbying, the development of additional water supplies, and evaluating possible ways to reduce freight costs. The identification and ultimate production of a "high end" product was also considered a potential opportunity.

Carbon County may want to evaluate commercial hemp production as a potential industry.

Public access through private property should only be permitted with landowner approval.

Public access should be encouraged and accessible via public lands. However, the public needs to be respectful of adjoining private lands.

There is a need to continue to work on improving federal regulations to help the rancher and larger landowner. Existing regulations are too burdensome. County needs to look at long-term trends and evaluate the impact of existing regulations. Federal agencies should allow more flexibility to ranchers.

Tourism

In promoting tourism, the County should consider the Rocky Mountains. A Continental Divide National Scenic Trail is located north and south of Wyoming. The Land Use Plan should consider proposing the extension of the national trail through Carbon County. Such an extension would attract some hikers. At this time, BLM still has an opportunity to locate this trail to go through Carbon County.

Tourism efforts should be promoted Countywide. Such promotion should include the variety of recreational opportunities that are available such as fishing, arrowhead and rock hunting, biking, and camping.

Encourage mountain biking.

The County needs to improve what we already have, promote existing recreational opportunities, and locate specific sites where visitors can go.

Establish a center or facility where tourists could learn more about available recreational opportunities and visitor services.

Infrastructure/Public Services

Residents who voiced issues regarding infrastructure and public services indicated that there is a growing need for more lands to accommodate the disposal of domestic wastes in Rawlins.

There is a need for public transportation in Rawlins.

More doctors are needed in Carbon County.

In terms of recreation, the establishment of ice skating opportunities was viewed as desirable. It was mentioned, however, that these opportunities are already available in Rawlins.

The development of an indoor arena for rodeos, calf roping, and other events, e.g., car shows and circus, was recommended. Another speaker countered this suggestion by proposing that the County use what facilities we already have, e.g., County fairground.

County needs to identify what repairs are needed to improve existing County roads. Some roads should be abandoned, but some new roads should be developed.

Concern was expressed over the breaking up of larger land parcels into smaller parcels. This trend will ultimately impact public services and Wyoming lifestyles.

Land Use Management

County should adopt the Uniform Building Code. However, the County may want to adopt some local amendments so that the County does not get over zealous in their enforcement.

Work with landowners and federal agencies to determine specific areas for recreational use.

Provide incentives to landowners to keep wildlife on property. Such efforts should be coordinated with Wyoming Game and Fish, as well as other resource management agencies.

**March 21 Public Meeting
Saratoga, Wyoming**

Population and Residential Growth

A variety of comments were heard on this issue. Resident views ranged from a desire for no new growth to limited controlled growth in the Platte Valley. Others believed that more substantive growth would occur. As a result, we should be prepared and plan for such growth.

Speakers urged that future residential growth should occur within existing towns. If growth should take place outside of incorporated towns, nearby municipalities should be able to accommodate future demands upon utilities and other public services.

Future growth should be orderly and be located on non-productive agricultural lands.

Economy

The economy needs to diversify. Technological changes have modified how we communicate. Consequently, new opportunities are available.

Employment

Economic factors will affect future growth in the County. Unfortunately, there are no opportunities for our children to make a living here. We are obligated to provide them with jobs so that they will have a choice to stay or move outside of the County for employment.

Small Business

It was pointed out that new small businesses and industries need to be created. One person suggested that this might be accomplished by working with a university. Others thought the involvement of the university would be too time consuming.

Timber Industry

A spokesman for Louisiana-Pacific Company indicated that the local timber industry requires a steady supply of timber resources to harvest. Otherwise, the industry will not be able to continue operations in Carbon County. At the present time, Louisiana Pacific is hanging on by importing timber from other forests in Wyoming and Colorado.

Another speaker indicated that the lack of road access in the Medicine Bow National Forest is limiting timber production in Carbon County.

Tourism

Tourism and recreation should be considered as an industry in Carbon County.

The focus of tourism in the County has always been for the summer and fall months when numerous outdoor recreational opportunities are available.

Greater attention to be devoted to how we can improve and increase visitor activities and services in the other seven months of the year.

A destination point within the County needs to be created.

Improve and develop different types of visitor accommodations and facilities. This will encourage visitors to stay longer.

Infrastructure/Public Services

Support and develop infrastructure and public services that will allow our lifestyle to continue. Preserve the identity of our area. People have chosen to live here for what we have.

Some residents commute far away to work; consequently, some do not mind if public services are not close to home.

A portion of incoming residents, who will move here in the future, will be wealthy enough to do what they want. These future residents will be able to build their own infrastructure.

Land Use Management

Zone land uses where you want them to occur.

Private landowners do not think that the County can tell them what to do with their land. Private property rights will be challenging in the development of the Land Use Plan.

Smaller cottage industries need to be zoned correctly.

Existing zoning system is discouraging and inconsistent.

Property tax rates need to be variable.

Lands in the County should be for multiple land uses. Environmental groups are restricting land uses in many areas.

Some private landowners are restricting public access through their lands.

August 7, 1996 Public Meeting Elk Mountain, Wyoming

Population and Residential Growth

Residents indicated that, at least, some population and residential growth is inevitable and desirable.

One Rawlins resident hoped that the Land Use Plan would address and include requirements for the subdivision of lands into parcels that are greater than 35 acres. The suggestion was made that such requirements would help control the amount of future subdivision activity.

It was also recommended that future residential expansion should be encouraged in the vicinity of existing municipalities rather than establishing additional remote subdivisions or new communities.

Many landowners of Wyoming property are not Wyoming residents. Wyoming residents cannot compete with more wealthy outsiders.

Infrastructure/Public Services

Future land developers should be encouraged to build near existing infrastructure that is available in the ten municipalities. Otherwise, the development of more public services will be required.

North of Elk Mountain, one Rawlins resident suggested that surface water resources significantly impact groundwater resources.

Higher nutrient levels have been detected in Elk Mountain's groundwater supply. One resident recommended that Elk Mountain needs a centralized sewer system. Effluent from septic tanks may be the problem.

Future water contamination problems also exist in Ryan Park where there is a centralized community water system. Unfortunately, individual septic tank systems and leachfields are used in the area. Local soils are inadequate to treat domestic wastewater. Consequently, water resources in the area will eventually become contaminated, if they are not already.

A resident from Elk Mountain said that water quality was a more important issue than the quantity of water that is available. The majority of those present concurred that water quality is influenced by various factors and that every area of the County is a little different.

It was asked at what point should sewer systems be required. One person suggested that they could be tied to the results of water quality monitoring wells, or results from percolation tests.

Environment

Protect the beauty of natural vistas in the County. The meadow areas and vistas between Elk Mountain and Interstate 80 should be preserved.

Something should be included in the Land Use Plan to avoid some of the mistakes that have been experienced by other counties in the State, e.g., Platte County hog operation. It was recommended that specific criterion for this type of operation should be incorporated into the Land Use Plan. It was also pointed out that the Wyoming Outdoor Council outlined some criteria in a recent newsletter.

Concern was expressed for the number of roads into the Medicine Bow National Forest (MBNF). One resident also pointed that the Forest Service needs to deal with erosion that is occurring on roads in the MBNF.

People live in Carbon County and love it for what is. However, it doesn't mean that there will not be change.

Science needs to be applied to specific environmental problems. Politics should be left out.

Resource Management Policies of Federal Agencies

The Land Use Plan should provide insights to future federal land management decisions and be applied to the related National Environmental Policy Act processes that are related to these decisions. The Land Use Plan should link the County's economic conditions to the loss of open space, wildlife habitat, biodiversity, watershed conservation, and other issues of federal agencies.

Memorandums of understanding should be established with appropriate federal agencies.

There is a lack of local control in federal resource management decisions. Consequently, many conflicting and questionable policies are made. For example, the U.S. Forest Service requires the replanting of sagebrush in one area while the Bureau of Land Management requires the eradication of sage in a nearby area.

One resident said that private property rights should be upheld. Ranchers should be allowed to handle their own allotments. The Land Use Plan, however, can help keep federal agencies in check.

The Land Use Plan should encourage the blocking of private and public lands to permit greater recreational access. The checkerboard of federal and private lands, which is located roughly 20 miles north and south of the Union Pacific Railroad corridor, is a constraint to providing increased recreational access.

There are increasing hang-ups to land exchanges such as archaeological research requirements. In land exchanges, agencies are not looking at the uses of lands being exchanged. There needs to be greater discussion between federal agencies and private landowners that are involved in a proposed exchange.

In the recent Dana Meadow trade, the Bureau of Land Management may swap for private lands that already provide public access. In the future, lands that are exchanged by federal agencies to private landowners should be those lands that do not have public access.

Land Use Plan Process

It was recommended that the Planning Commission should obtain more specific insights and recommendations from other residents and groups that are not attending the public meetings

throughout the County. It was suggested that smaller discussion groups be formed and encouraged to participate in the Land Use Plan process.

Land use planning should evolve around the evils that are recognized by the community. It is impossible to predict human behavior.

Economy

Many dollars of expenditures by Carbon County residents are leaking to other areas, e.g., Casper, Cheyenne, and Fort Collins.

One resident recommended that the establishment of a State lottery should be considered to increase government revenues. However, at least one other speaker disagreed because of potential social problems that may be generated.

August 8, 1996 Meeting Sinclair, Wyoming

Population and Residential Growth

Residents of Sinclair are long-term residents. Good employment opportunities at the Sinclair Refinery keep people in the community.

Two Hanna residents said that their community would take a dive in a few years because the Cyprus-Shoshone Mine may close. In fact, Cyprus has told its employees to look at other employment opportunities. Some employees have already transferred to other mining areas.

Corporate ranches in Carbon County may not develop their properties. However, smaller large ranches may need to subdivide to remain economically viable. Some ranches cannot keep afloat in ranching. Those ranches that would sell a portion of the ranch, but try to keep the lands associated with the base ranch operation.

Environment

Environmentalists seem to go after those industries that are clean, low fuel burning, etc. Environmentalists opposed even the wind energy project in Carbon County's Arlington area.

There should be a balance between conservation and development.

One resident doubts that small businesses related to timber industry can keep going with the type of federal regulations being pursued by federal agencies.

The true conservation of natural resources should take precedence over environmental regulations. With today's reclamation, one person employed in the mining industry indicated the natural environmental could be improved after mining areas are reclaimed.

Economy

Agriculture

Small farms and ranches are worth saving. Federal regulations should be created to encourage and support these operations.

Retail Trade

If larger retail chain stores were located in Carbon County, more consumer expenditures would remain in Carbon County. At the same time, the larger chain stores might impact some local retail stores, but not the local stores in downtown Rawlins.

Shopping at Wal-Mart or Kmart is a recreational activity for some local residents in Hanna.

If local businesses in Rawlins or Saratoga would advertise more in other communities of Carbon County, County residents will become more aware of what goods and services are available in Carbon County. As a result, more expenditures of County residents would be made inside Carbon County.

Some local businesses are very competitive with similar businesses outside of the County. Others do not seem to care. At the same time, more competition will help lower retail prices in Carbon County.

Employment

One Hanna resident expressed that many young people would stay in Carbon County if they had jobs.

Tourism

Tourism is part of Sinclair's economic base; many people travel through the community for hunting and other recreational activities. Increasing numbers of visitors are bringing in more dollars to the local economy. However, as ranches continue to prohibit recreational access on private lands, a reduction in visitor expenditures is expected.

Outdoor recreation is OK, but there is a need to open more public lands for public access. This would help take the burden from private landowners.

The U.S. Forest Service needs to develop a good road management plan. When people are distributed more evenly, all recreationists will have a good outdoor experience. The State Game and Fish Department can also do some things to provide better management of recreational activities.

The State and County promote tourism outside of Wyoming. However, when visitors negatively impact our lifestyles, we complain. Another person suggested that perhaps that the County and its municipalities should not promote tourism.

The lodging tax is good and is working well to provide dollars for tourism promotion. The gas tax was a good idea.

Other than hunters, there is no tourism in Hanna. There is no real draw for visitors except possibly as a gateway to the Seminoe Reservoir. People do not know that road access to the Reservoir is available from Hanna, or what the condition of the road is.

Saratoga businesses that are involved in tourism are probably successful because they also cater to local residents.

Infrastructure/Public Services

In Sinclair, residents are pretty satisfied with the local infrastructure and public services.

Infrastructure in Rawlins was developed primarily during the economic boon of the 1970s and remains in good condition. Existing infrastructure can accommodate a larger resident population.

Hanna has more infrastructure than is actually needed. A new high school gymnasium was recently completed. The town landfill is reaching capacity and other alternatives need to be examined. There presently are no attempts to recycle materials that would help reduce incoming solid waste volumes. New landfills are becoming more difficult to develop.

In Rawlins, however, there may not be a need for landfill expansion for another 50 years. Recycling is also taking place. The sale of recycled materials is being reviewed, but a greater volume of recycled materials is needed to make this more feasible.

Federal Land and Resource Management Policies

One resident indicated that more local, individual control is needed at the County level. The Land Use Plan will give us more control over our own lands.

Current resource management regulations are out of control. For example, there are ridiculous reclamation requirements, e.g., the replanting of shrubs per meter. For watershed management, sagebrush areas have to be burned. Sagebrush reclamation requirements should be eliminated; it will come back anyway. Around coal mines in the Hanna area, wildlife is everywhere. Requirements also mandate coal mines to restore mined areas to original contours even when the establishment of new drainage may be desirable to the environment.

The checkerboard of lands, which is present 20 miles north and south of the UP Railroad corridor, constrains public access to federal lands.

August 19, 1996 Meeting Baggs, Wyoming

Scope of Land Use Plan

One resident expressed concern that the County Planner may be preparing the Land Use Plan in too much detail. It was also noted that there might be community resistance to any proposed changes in zoning, e.g., from RAM to residential. The community may suspect that proposed changes in zoning will result in increased property tax assessments.

A land use plan that will bring about a cooperative working relationship between federal agencies and the County would be good.

Any proposed changes in land use regulations should be as user friendly as possible.

No land use management system should be incorporated in the Land Use Plan that hinders economic growth.

Population and Residential Growth

The Carbon County School District #1 has observed a reduction of about 220 students since 1993. Consequently, the School District does not expect growth in the total number of students in the District. Water will limit the extent of future growth in the Little Snake River area.

Carbon County still has the potential to retain their vision for future growth; the Land Use Plan can promote this vision.

Carbon County should learn from the experience of nearby communities such as Steamboat Springs, Colorado.

How can the population be balanced to sustain existing infrastructure and limit a future population that will generate increased public service demands?

One reason why people buy land and build homes outside of municipal areas is for a different life style that includes raising horses, 4-H steers, larger parcels of land, distance from neighbors, and lower property taxes.

Infrastructure/Public Services

The Town of Baggs needs improvements in water purification. Existing supplies are presently adequate.

Baggs is the water source for Upper Colorado; the North Platte River serves the rest of Carbon County. The Land Use Plan should recognize the differences in the Great Divide Basin.

Water will sustain what is already here and give stability to our existing ranches and related agricultural production.

A reduction in public services affects the quality of life, as well as the tax revenue base that is needed to maintain public services.

Economy

An increase in technology has caused a decline in jobs which, in turn, has reduced the population of the Little Snake River area.

Because of increased technology in the mining industry, deep coal reserves can be mined.

Retirees that come to Wyoming will bring some economic growth.

Recreation can bring some economic activity in the Little Snake River area.

The proposed water resource development project for the Little Snake River area would increase economic opportunities for agriculture and recreation.

The availability of fiber optics encourages some small businesses to open.

Land Use Management

State regulations do not permit the local regulation of land subdivisions that exceed 34 acres.

In subdivision development, the Land Use Plan would recommend utility corridors. The location of utilities cannot be controlled on individual land parcels.

Severance taxes are still imposed upon underground coal mining, but not ad valorem taxes.

Some land use plans use "open space" terminology. Subdivision regulations could help regulate the amount of future open space in undeveloped areas.

The County Commissioners Association and some property owners will resist change to the regulation of land subdivision that are greater than 35 acres. When proposals were made in the State Legislature, these interests did not want the State Engineers Office or the State Department of Environmental Quality to have more authority over land development activities.

Manage specifically if you want to achieve good environmental management.

The County needs to be more proactive rather than more regulatory.

The County should prepare a tough Land Use Plan even if it goes in the face of federal agencies.

The County needs to create an environment that allows what we want for our quality of life, and is less desirable for what we do not want.

Federal Resource Management Policies

The Medicine Bow National Forest is over-managed by the U.S. Forest Service.

The loss of AUMs via the management practices of the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management generate consequences that are detrimental to Carbon County. Ranches need to have adequate AUMS to keep economically viable. Federal agency representatives do not understand the economic consequences of AUM reductions.

Ranchers could be more viable if ranchers were allowed to make their own day-to-day management decisions, react more responsively to market conditions, and given greater flexibility in management decisions.

State Game and Fish and other State agency representatives need to be involved in local resource management decisions so that federal agencies do not evaluate situations solely on the basis of federal mandates.

U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management need to establish a picture of how the land should be and monitor the long-term trends, e.g., impact of grazing on grasses. Ranchers cannot afford to make a long-term switch from sheep to cattle.

The Land Use Plan could state that the County will meet with federal agencies "X" number of times per year to review allotments and land management decisions.

Environment

Massive subdivisions ruin any environment.

Aesthetics and views need to be maintained.

August 20, 1996 Meeting Encampment, Wyoming

Population and Residential Growth

Growth is good, but it has to be controlled. If there is no control, our infrastructure will collapse.

A problem may be that the community's existing attitude that says things should not change. However, change may not be needed for Encampment to survive; it may be that the community is just fine the way it is.

A few more people in the community are OK, but this growth will not be enough to change what we have. Slow growth would be desirable. However, slow, controlled growth will come up against private property rights.

People move here for the rural lifestyle and nice people. At the same time, young people are moving out of the community because there are no jobs.

Those people who do not want growth should not sell their land.

One resident said that he did not mind the inconveniences that come with living in a small town.

Infrastructure/Public Services

It would be advantageous to have a few more people to cover the cost of municipal infrastructure.

More young people with families are needed to keep our local schools.

Without adequate infrastructure, e.g., water system, more people will not move to Encampment.

Encampment has a water supply that is capable of serving 20,000 people. There is, however, a problem with management. The Town of Encampment presently does not have the capability to produce water that is consistent with federal drinking water standards. The lack of meters is another problem.

Landfills in the County are becoming a problem; the community needs to look more seriously at opportunities for recycling.

The Land Use Plan should include fire protection and ambulance service needs in smaller communities of the County. Some residents expressed preference for maintaining and/or making improvements to these services.

Improve infrastructure, e.g., water, sewer and housing.

Economy

Employment

More jobs are needed. Our industries need to be fed to provide more employment.

More job opportunities would be possible if the jobs were created on the local level.

Tourism

As a destination, the County offers OK hunting and fishing, limited horseback riding opportunities, and boating opportunities at Seminoe Reservoir. In terms of the proposed ski area at Green Mountain, there are no accommodations or transportation services to support this area.

The community needs to determine what makes itself a destination point, e.g., good place for retreats.

The community is creating a two-edged sword. By inviting more people to use our lands for recreation, these people will want to bring in more ideas and thoughts to our community. The community should look at what is happening in other areas that have dealt with these changes in community attitudes, e.g., Denver.

Improve visitor accommodations and food services in the Encampment-Riverside area.

Timber Industry

Because of all the federal regulations, there is no logging activity in the Medicine Bow National Forest. These regulations are, in essence, fragmenting families, as timber workers have to live elsewhere, or work considerable distances from home. However, there seems to be a lot of timber nearby the Riverside-Encampment area.

Economic Development

In terms of economic development, the community needs to sell what it has, e.g., quality of life and other attractions.

The County should investigate the location of niche opportunities with larger corporations, e.g., smaller AT&T office.

The community also needs to establish greater telecommunication capabilities.

Federal Resource Management Policy

Regulations being made by federal agencies in response to the National Environmental Policy Act regulations are getting bigger without local input.

How can individuals impact land use management decisions that are made by our federal agencies? The federal agencies do not seem to hear us.

Less federal regulations on timber, mining, oil and gas, and small business are needed.

The management of federal lands requires consideration of various interests, not just communities.

The U.S. Forest Service needs to be more conscientious in reviewing land management decisions.

All federal land users need to better educate themselves about the federal lands that they are using.

Environment

Passive recreation is good.

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY ISSUES AND PRIORITIES

The three surveys and eight public meetings provide the Carbon County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners with a significant list of concerns and issues that are relevant to the Carbon County Land Use Plan. The substantive response and participation of Carbon County residents clearly indicates the concern of local residents and their commitment to the Land Use Plan process. The tabulation, documentation, review and evaluation of the responses and insights from the Carbon County community also point to several primary areas of concern.

Resource Management by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management

Grazing Allotments

A majority of Carbon County ranchers believe that federal resource management is burdensome and narrowly focused upon the conservation of fish and wildlife, water resources, and related habitat. Many ranchers also agree that few management decisions of the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are based upon any serious consideration of the impact of proposed resource management decisions upon the economic viability of local ranches. Ranch survey results indicate that ranching activities in Carbon County account for about \$27.3 million of direct employment and expenditures in the Carbon County economy.

Despite their disappointment with federal agencies, it is clear that ranchers want to establish a better working relationship with both the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. There is a preference for more locally based decisions. Greater participation by Carbon County and the ranching community in individual allotment decisions and other resource management programs is clearly desired. Ranchers believe that their experience on the land should be sought by federal agency representatives and integrated into agency decisions.

Forest Management

Many residents of the smaller communities in Carbon County desire an increased level of timber harvests that is needed to sustain the operation of timber mills in Encampment and Saratoga. The dependency on this industry has significant implications upon the future lifestyle of the residents in some of the smaller communities of the County where employment and household income opportunities are more limited. Many of the residents in these communities believe their desire to live and work in the community is regularly overshadowed by environmental concerns.

In contrast, the more urbanized community of Rawlins, as well as Sinclair, Elk Mountain, and Medicine Bow, generally have greater concern for resource conservation.

Economic Viability of the Carbon County Economy

The Carbon County economy is based upon several industries and sources of income for local residents. Agriculture, mining, oil and gas, timber harvest and production, recreation, and transportation represent the economic base of the County. The continued viability of these economic activities is a concern to Carbon County residents.

Local residents are extremely cognizant that employment opportunities are somewhat limited to much of the labor force in Carbon County. Resource-based industries are highly cyclical; layoffs are common. Consequently, the maintenance of long-term employment is tenuous for much of the private sector employees in Carbon County.

Many residents, for example, fear that increased federal regulations and resource management policies will continue to adversely impact the timber industry. Such impacts will adversely affect workers at local timber mills in Saratoga and Encampment, as well as various smaller companies that support the timber industry.

Ultimately, any significant reduction in the viability of any segment of the County's primary economic base will ultimately impact numerous small business owners which annually receive about \$40 million in indirect expenditures from Carbon County's five primary industries. While blessed with a diverse economy, Carbon County residents are keenly aware that the presence of resource-based industries can generate significant swings in overall economic activity. Most of the County's existing adult population recall or experienced personal repercussions from the regional economic downturn that occurred between the late 1970s and early 1980s. For this reason, most residents would apparently like to see a more stable economy in the County.

Resource Conservation of Land, Water and Wildlife Resources

The rural environmental setting of Carbon County is blessed with an abundance of land and wildlife resources, as well as a limited surface and groundwater supplies. These resources hold significant value to Carbon County residents. Most residents of Carbon County have resided in the County for a significant period of time. The community's agricultural base and significant open space areas afford numerous opportunities for residents to observe and become well acquainted with these resources. A special appreciation of these resources is evident because of ranchers' dependency upon land and water resources. Residents who work in non-agricultural occupations regularly come in contact with wildlife resources during their drives to and from work, and their participation in various outdoor recreational activities.

A significant number of County residents believe that greater attention should be given to the conservation of water, land and wildlife resources rather than increased timber harvests or increased oil and gas production. This perspective is believed to be based upon a perceived fear that resource exploitation may eventually generate significant impacts upon:

- recreational sites and areas in the Medicine Bow National Forest;
- wildlife and aquatic habitat areas; as well as,
- vistas and views in the western part of Carbon County.

The maintenance of these treasured resources is dependent upon both land and resource management policies of federal, State, and County agencies. The residents of Carbon County desire the County to assume a more aggressive role in federal decisions that impact these resources.